UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,614	08/31/2000	Gregory L. Slaughter	5181-67400	4149

7590   12/22/2003

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX   78767-0398

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	16

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 October 2003_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4,5,7-14,16-27,29,30 and 32-50_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4,5,7-14,16-27,29,30 and 32-50_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _1 and 15_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 20 October

2003. Claims 1-2,4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-50 remain in this application.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-2,4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by **Roberts et al.**

As to claims 1, 14, and 26, Roberts teaches (col.3, line 56-col.4, line 59) a method

comprising:

- a client (*a user/web service consumers*) accessing a space service (*a web services*

directory) according to a schema (*schemas*) for the space service, wherein the space service is

operable to store one or more service advertisements (*for a business or enterprise that contains*

available services for use/XML services/web services) in a space, wherein each of the service

advertisements comprises information (*metadata*) which is usable to access a corresponding

service (*web services*), and wherein the space service is configured to provide functions to

manage or access the one or more service advertisements in the space (*provides access control,*

organization, interface definition, management, and operation of web services), wherein the

functions of the space service are invoked according to the schema for the space service which

specifies one or more messages for invoking functions of the space service, and wherein the

schema specifies messages usable to read advertisements from the space and publish

advertisements in the space (*provides a protocol where the type of data being used can be*

identified. XML can do this in part using predefined "schemas" that can be used to understand

the type of data being transmitted; col.4, lines 12-33/*XML schemas that define the type of data*

that is supported in the parameters; col.7, lines 1-32);

- the client selecting one of the service advertisements from the space; and the client

using the information from the selected service advertisement to execute the corresponding

service (*When a requester wants to run a WSA, he generates an HTTP request to run a special*

type of web service called a "model-based" web service. These web services have the

responsibility of maintaining the runtime models for corresponding to WSA's; col.5, lines 17-64).

As to claims 2 and 27, Roberts teaches the client sending messages to the space service

at a Uniform Resource Identifier (col.5, lines 17-64 and col.13, lines 48).

As to claims 4 and 29, Roberts teaches the schema is expressed in a data representation

language (col.6, line 66 - col.7, line 32).

As to claims 5 and 30, Roberts teaches he data representation language comprises

eXtensible Markup Language (col.4, lines 1-11).

As to claims 7 and 32, Roberts teaches (col.3, lines 22-26) the client accessing the space

service comprises the client sending at least one of the messages specified in the schema to the

space service (col.4, lines 12-50 and col.6, line 66 - col.7, line 32).

As to claims 8 and 33, Roberts teaches the client accessing the space service comprises

the client searching the one or more service advertisements stored in the space (col.4, lines 12-

50).

As to claims 12 and 37, Roberts teaches generating results in response client to the

executing the corresponding service for the selected service advertisement for the; and

publishing the results in a network-addressable location, wherein information usable to access

the network-addressable location is provided in an advertisement for the network

addressable-location (col.4, lines 12-50).

As to claims 13 and 38, Roberts teaches the client sending an instantiation request to the

space after the selecting one of the service advertisements from the space; obtaining a lease for

the corresponding service for the selected service advertisement; sending the lease and the

selected service advertisement to the client; and constructing a gate for the client to access the

corresponding service (col.5, lines 19-64).

As to claim 19, refer to claim 6 above for rejection.

As to claim 20, refer to claim 8 above for rejection.

As to claims 24-25, refer to claims 12-13 above for rejection.

As to claims 9 and 34, refer to claim 2 above for rejection.

As to claims 10 and 35, refer to claim 4 above for rejection.

As to claims 11 and 36, refer to claim 5 above for rejection.

As to claim 16, refer to claim 2 above for rejection.

As to claim 17, refer to claim 4 above for rejection.

As to claim 18, refer to claim 5 above for rejection.

As to claim 21, refer to claim 9 above for rejection.

As to claim 22, refer to claim 10 above for rejection.

As to claim 23, refer to claim 11 above for rejection.

As to claims 39, 43, and 47, the rejection of claims 1, 14, and 26 are incorporated herein in full. Claims 39, 43, and 47 further recite "wherein the set of information is expressed in a data representation language, and wherein the space is addressable at a Uniform Resource Identifier."

Roberts teaches wherein the set of information is expressed in a data representation language (*XML*; col.4, lines 1-59), and wherein the space is addressable at a Uniform Resource Identifier (*metadada about web services that have been published for use by web service consumers...web service consumers can gain all information about a set of published web services*; col.4, lines 24-45/*URL*; col.13, lines 25-67).

As to claims 40, 44, and 48, refer to claim 5 above for rejection.

As to claims 41, 45, and 49, Roberts teaches the space comprises one or more web pages which are viewable by a web browser (col.4, lines 12-59).

As to claims 42, 46, and 50, refer to claim 4 above for rejection.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The broad claim language used continues to read on the reference presented in the previous office action.

Applicant argues that "the XML schema in Roberts is clearly not a schema that specifies one or more messages for invoking functions of the space service including messages usable by a client to read advertisements from the space...an XML schema as used in Roberts does not specify messages usable by a client for accessing a service" (Remarks, pp.2-3).

In response, Roberts does teach the recited claim limitations. As shown through the

mapping provided in the claim rejections, Roberts' teachings *"provides a protocol where the type*

of data being used can be identified. XML can do this in part using predefined "schemas" that

can be used to understand the type of data being transmitted"(col.4, lines 12-33) and *"XML*

schemas that define the type of data that is supported in the parameters" (col.7, lines 1-32)

read-on the aforementioned claim 1 recitation.

Applicant argues that "Roberts does not teach a client selecting a service advertisement

from the space, and the client using the information from the selected service advertisement to

execute the corresponding service" (Remarks, page 3).

Contrary to Applicant's contention, Roberts' teachings *"When a requester wants to run a*

WSA, he generates an HTTP request to run a special type of web service called a "model-based"

web service. These web services have the responsibility of maintaining the runtime models for

corresponding to WSA's" (col.5, lines 17-64) does meet the limitations as broadly claimed.

Applicant argues that "clients in Roberts do not retrieve information from a space"

(Remarks, page 4).

Contrary to Applicant's contention, *"web service consumers can gain all information*

about a set of published web services" (col.4, lines 34-45) as taught by Roberts does meet the

limitations as broadly claimed.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or fax to:
(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)
(703) 746-7238 (for After Final communications)
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications)

VHN
December 13, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100